# HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 24 Saturday, June 15, 1957 Washington, D. C.

**News Section** *Printed in Two Sections*

**BUDGET CUTS:** *How much?* (page 1)

**ADJOURNMENT:** *When?* (page 2)

**MODERN GOP SCANDALS:** *Indiana story* (page 3)

**CHINA TRADE:** *Ike vs. GOP platform* (page 1)

**PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY:** *A solution* (page 4)

**Budget Bulletin:** Size up, from Capitol Hill, of the cut-the-Budget situation today:

(1) Best opinion is that cuts of the 1958 Budget will show a total of between 4 and 5 billion dollars — not much less. That's a "cold turkey" view by old hands in the lobbies.

(2) A number of members have visited home constituencies on week ends recently. Sentiment at home remains strong for the cuts, even if tax reduction will not follow until next year. Mail to offices on Capitol Hill continues strong (Senator Bridges says his is 10 to 1 for Budget cuts). The two TV shows by the President had virtually no effect.

**(3) Foreign aid will finally show an over-all cut of $1.1 billion, despite all the propaganda to the contrary — that is the word from inside the Appropriations Committee. The small cut in the "authorization for foreign aid" means little. The test will be in the amount of "appropriations for foreign aid" — the next step. Watch for that.**

(4) Real trouble is feared in the appropriations for public works. The President's request is filled with "pork" — things demanded by "local interests." That's the danger — the tug of local interests on the Congressman's coattail.

**Foreign Affairs:** About the Khrushchev broadcast: talk of a reply to the Russian leader is mostly talk, and a waste of time. It is too late — is the word. Feeling now is quite strong that the Columbia Broadcasting System should have exacted such a TV reply as a precondition before giving Khrushchev a chance to "get into the American living room" with his lying propaganda.

● Antiappeasement forces are rallying to discredit the propaganda for a relaxation of trade with Red China. Since the President gave one of his halting approvals to such trade, antiappeasers are throwing it back at him: "look at the platform."

For, the Republican 1956 Campaign Platform adopted at San Francisco says: "We are against trade with the Communist world that would threaten the security of the United States and our allies."

● Victory of the Conservative Party in Canadian elections affords some encouragement to conservatives here. The descent of the long-dominant Liberals, who have been very New Dealish, was very sharp indeed. Few can deny that the Canada outcome is a part of a rightward trend in the English-speaking countries of the world.

**In the wake of victory, Ottawa sources report to HUMAN EVENTS that the Conservatives plan to set up a Royal Commission to investigate the causes of the suicide of Ambassador Norman, and that this may involve mention of a score of Americans and Canadians in high places.**

**Girard Case:** As the controversy over Army Specialist 3/C William S. Girard spun to new, dizzy heights this week, confusion reigned over many of the issues involved. Some of the questions hanging in the air, with the answers secured by HUMAN EVENTS, are as follows:

(1) *What will happen to Girard?*

The hearings by Judge Joseph C. McGarraghy, it is believed, will not interfere with the plan to turn Girard over to the Japanese. In a previous case, *May et al. v. Wilson et al.* (February 2, 1956) — a test of the validity of our "Status of Forces" agreement with Japan — McGarraghy ruled that ". . . the administrative agreement which was entered into was a valid exercise of the administrative power of the Executive. . . . In my judgment there are no constitutional rights of the plaintiff which are being violated. . . ."

**In short, the suspected "deal" between Tokyo and Washington (see HUMAN EVENTS report on this for June 8) should go through according to previous appraisals.**

(2) *What, exactly, is our arrangement with Japan?*

An Administrative Agreement signed at Tokyo, February 28, 1952. The language relevant to the Girard case, affecting jurisdiction, appears in an amending protocol signed on September 29, 1953. Although patterned after the NATO "Status of Forces" treaty, say experts on the Hill, this understanding is not itself a treaty, but an executive agreement.

(3) *What are the facts in the dispute over "jurisdiction"?*

The agreement states that "offenses arising out of any act or omission done in the performance of official

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duty" by our servicemen come under U. S. jurisdiction. The Japanese say that, since Girard was not ordered to fire at the slain Japanese woman, the act was not "in the performance of official duty." American opinion holds that, since Girard was on duty at the time of the accident, the slaying was clearly an "act or omission" done in performing his duty. This interpretation was apparently accepted by Secretaries Wilson and Dulles in their joint statement last week (official Washington so far has treated the issue only in the vaguest terms). The Secretaries' decision to turn Girard over, it is said, is therefore counter to their own interpretation of the agreement.

(4) *What is Congress doing?*

Senator Eastland has proposed a "civil rights" amendment that would limit "Status of Forces" agreements to countries that will guarantee the same rights that are protected by the American Constitution. A House Foreign Affairs subcommittee will begin hearings momentarily. Subcommittee Chairman Omar Burleson (D.-Tex.), has expressed the opinion that the "Status of Forces" agreements should be cancelled.

Resolutions are currently before the House (H. J. Res. 16) and Senate (S. J. Res. 40) which would direct the President to take the steps necessary to curtail the agreements. Congress, responding to the heavy tide of letters protesting the Girard decision, may move to adopt these resolutions. Congressman Bow, sponsor of the House measure, is reportedly confident of favorable action.

(5) *What are the basic issues involved in the dispute?*

There are essentially three: (a) "Civil rights" — whether our soldiers, most of them conscriptees, can be deprived of their elementary rights as American citizens.

(b) "Executive agreements" — whether agreements such as that with Japan, negotiated by bureaucrats and not passed on by Congress, can take precedence over the United States Constitution; the legitimacy of the major (NATO) "Status of Forces" treaty is also called into question.

**A Supreme Court decision last week (in the case of two military wives convicted under court martial of slaying their husbands) is widely interpreted to mean that no treaty can override the Constitution. If this is so, say legal analysts, the "Status of Forces" treaty is null and void. In any case, the Bricker Amendment, explicitly stating the supremacy of the Constitution, should be enacted.**

(c) "Appeasement" — the Girard case highlights the readiness of U.S. globalists to use American soldiers as peace-offerings to an angry foreign country. Popular outcry over the Girard decision is viewed here as a hardening determination that the developing trend to appeasement of anti-American elements throughout the world must stop (see "Coexistence" item in last week's issue).

**Adjournment:** Capitol Hill observers detect the aroma of the annual drive for adjournment of Congress — a drive which this year, if reasonably successful, would spell "finis," for 1957 at least, to the Administration's civil rights, aid to education and other New Dealing programs.

**Senate Democratic Leader Lyndon Johnson, an astute individual not given to talking for the sake of hearing his own voice, is making private-conversation noises about a July 15 adjournment.**

Johnson, from Texas, is no advocate of the civil rights program. Publicly, he insists there will be some sort of Senate vote on it; his July 15 quitting date, however, probably would mean that Senate consideration of the civil rights bill, if any, would be confined to a mere token, with the bill being sidetracked when brief debate makes clear the intention of Southerners to filibuster.

Johnson kept the Senate's nose to the grindstone this week, cleaning up the calendar of appropriation bills which must be passed before Congress can knock off for the year. Only four of the regular supply bills now have not yet been acted upon by the Senate, and three of those have passed the House: Interior and Defense Departments, and legislative (the measure providing funds for Congress' own operations). Their passage is expected in a matter of days.

The fourth appropriation is for foreign aid. Because this is on a year-to-year basis, with no permanent legislative authorization, it must await completion of action on the $3.6 billion authorization bill now en route through Congress.

By the time these bills all are finally enacted, the Washington weather will be "hottin' up" and the Congressional rush to get home will be on. Do not count on much additional legislation being passed after that.

**GOP Politics:** How to deal with "Modern Republicans" and "crypto-Democrats" in the party — is the lesson drawn from a speech which Senator Barry Goldwater (R.-Ariz.) gave to the Wisconsin Republican convention late last week (June 2). Goldwater said that the dispute in the party on the subject of the Budget denotes a "healthy situation" and that the "Republican party will be stronger and more unified because of this experience."

**Goldwater laid emphasis on the party above all other considerations. He said that Republican accomplishments of the past five years were produced by the "genius" of the Republican party and not by President Eisenhower.**

The Arizonan said that Eisenhower considers himself "only one member of a large team" and would be "the first to deny the indispensability of any single personality."

Goldwater added that the Budget should be cut in the interest of preserving the "economic freedom and fiscal integrity of this nation."

Party leaders regard Goldwater as one of the most promising Senators, one who is gaining increased at-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tention in the news. He is running for re-election in Arizona and reportedly enjoys excellent chances of victory — enhanced, it is claimed, by his fearless "anti-me-tooism" and adherence to conservative party principles.

● A series of highway scandals in the state of Indiana — far from being affairs of merely local interest — have been linked with the "modern Republicanism" movement. For the scandals involve members of the last state regime headed by "modern Republican" Governor George Craig (which was ousted by the regular Republicans under Governor Handley and Senator Jenner). The Craig administration, it now appears, was ridden with graft and corruption — in which Craig henchmen in office allegedly made deals with land speculators to profit by the building of Federal highways through Indiana. The local Grand Jury is probing these matters, and now the U. S. Senate has begun hearings to unearth further instances of corruption.

The exposures seal the doom of the "modern Republican" clique in the Indiana GOP and further strengthen the position of the regular Republicans — not only Governor Handley, but also Senator Jenner, whose re-election next year is now regarded as a "sure thing."

● Meanwhile, the conservative Republicans on Capitol Hill stick to their course of collaboration with those Democrats who seem sincerely devoted to economy and refuse to be dissuaded by "modern Republican" appeals to support high spending. In the meeting of the Republican party officials here last week, the President's attempt to justify his requests for high appropriations for next year met with chilly response, although the gathering evidenced as usual cordial admiration for the Chief Executive.

Generally, GOP members of the House preferred to stick to their last in attending to civil rights and Budget legislation, rather than to the political meeting. A curious incident illustrated this attitude. On June 7, GOP leader Joe Martin told the House that the Republicans had a meeting downtown (it was the GOP gathering to hear the President). Democrats assumed that the GOP members would all clear out. What was their surprise when — on a quorum call to see how many members were present — it was discovered that there was a quorum and a great many Republicans had not left the House to go to hear the President. Apparently, they preferred to stay on to work on legislative business.

**Labor Front:** Irritation among the business community of the country and among conservatives on Capitol Hill is growing against the union-inspired drive to let the labor bosses off from real remedial legislation. "Let's pass an innocuous bill on welfare funds and adjourn" — that is not an attractive attitude against the public background of today.

Those who watch the labor picture express impatience with the attitude taken by Vice President Nixon early this week when he cautioned about blaming "an entire movement for the blunders and crimes of a minority" and to be wary of laws which would "destroy" unionism. Of course, no such spirit, intention or concrete plans for "destruction" are discernible anywhere today. Assertions to this effect are not true; they are simply shibboleths created to ward off fundamental reforms and to protect dictatorial labor bosses in their rights to steal and misuse funds and tyrannize over the individual members of the unions.

This impatience grows as voices in the press are raised against the developing "cover-up." Thus, Frank R. Kent, veteran national columnist and long-time critic of union abuses, put it this way (June 9): "Toss old Beck out on his ear, take away his graft, throw his union out of the combination, but leave Meany and Reuther alone. That's the big idea now . . . [But] the country does not want to see the Pecksniffs of the union racket get by with their false piety."

As this feeling grows stronger day by day, members of the McClellan Committee move to get the probe away from "beating the dead horse of Beck" and into real investigation of the activities of Reuther and the "liberal" unionists. Senator Curtis (R.-Neb.) wants to go into the matter of secondary boycotts. It is known that Senator Mundt has written Chairman McClellan a letter urging probes of other phases of the labor movement — such as violence and the use of "goon squads" by unions, of secondary boycotts (such as the Kohler situation), use of union collections from members in political activities. Senator Goldwater (see his article in HUMAN EVENTS for May 18) has shown growing impatience and reportedly has been talking of a "showdown" on the whole matter.

**Hells Canyon:** The incurable "liberal" Democratic weakness for socialistic "Big Government" legislation, even in the teeth of public demands for economy, is a source of much puzzled discussion in the Capital this week. The most notable example of this collectivist yen is seen in the impending battle over the proposed "high dam" in Hells Canyon, Idaho. Senate legislation to authorize Federal construction of a single dam on the Snake River site was defeated last year, 51-41. Republicans, with the exceptions of Langer and Wiley, voted solidly against it. Eight conservative Democrats broke with their party to oppose the "Big Government" measure.

The Idaho Power Company, licensed (as of July 27, 1955) by the Federal Power Commission to begin construction, has invested an estimated $48 million in starting three "small" dams in Hells Canyon. Now the proposal for the "high dam" is back. And, as lines form for the current battle (expected day by day), supporters of the Big Government proposal are conspicuously present in the Democratic party. Foremost laborers in the Federal-dam vineyard are Democratic Senators Morse (who introduced the current bill, S. 555), Neuberger and Kefauver.

Prospective leaders in the fight against Federal encroachment, on the other hand, are Senators Watkins, Dworshak and Goldwater — all Republicans.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Leftist forces hope to make inroads through their current diversionary uproar over a "fast tax writeoff" granted to the Idaho Power Company by the Office of Defense Mobilization. Rapid amortizations to spur development of projects relating to national defense (the Hells Canyon dams will service essential military and atomic installations) have been authorized by Democratic and Republican Administrations over the years. Senator Kefauver — through his "Monopoly" Subcommittee — is now attempting to warp the subject of tax policy (which Capital observers admit may be usefully debated) to confuse the quite separate issue of Federal encroachment vs. private enterprise.

Specifically, the "tax writeoff" diversion serves to pull public attention away from the enormous costs to the taxpayers of the proposed Federal project in Hells Canyon. The Department of Interior has estimated that the project would cost over half a billion dollars ($500,000,000). This sum, which does not include the settlement that would have to be made to the Idaho Power Company if it were forced to abandon its construction program, would cost the taxpayers of Oregon (home state of high-dam advocates Morse and Neuberger) over $5 million. Constituents of Tennessee's Senator Kefauver would be assessed over $6 million — for a dam in Idaho. Texans, represented by the Democratic leaders in both the House and Senate, would pay over $22 million.

Constituents of some other Democratic Senators expected to vote for the measure (all but Clark, a freshman Senator, voted for it last year) would shoulder the following tax burdens: Massachusetts (Kennedy), $17 million; Missouri (Hennings, Symington), $12 million; Illinois (Douglas) $38 million; Michigan (McNamara), $28 million; Minnesota (Humphrey), $8 million; Pennsylvania (Clark), $35 million.

**Fifth Amendment:** The International Association of Machinists this week fired three organizers for invoking the Fifth Amendment as justification for refusing to answer questions about past Communist affiliations.

The I.A.M.'s forthright action is viewed by observers as a refreshing contrast to the double standard set up by Walter Reuther and his United Automobile Workers concerning invocation of the privilege against self-incrimination (see HUMAN EVENTS for June 1).

The AFL-CIO Executive Council, prodded by Reuther and other former C.I.O. bosses, last February adopted its "Code of Ethics" containing a clause that any union officer or representative invoking the Fifth Amendment before a duly-constituted investigating body should lose his union office.

When a group of U.A.W. local officials invoked the amendment last month in refusing to answer questions about possible Red affiliations put by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Reuther and the U.A.W. hierarchy decided that the Code's provision applied only to inquiries about union affairs; that subversive connections were not union affairs, and that the ban therefore did not apply.

The I.A.M. Executive Council on March 19 adopted its own code specifying that the Fifth Amendment should not be invoked by union officers for any questions. It ordered the dismissals after the three organizers all testified before the Senate subcommittee that they are not now Communists, but refused to talk about the past.

The I.A.M. is headed by Al Hayes, chairman of the AFL-CIO Ethical Practices Committee. It said the three organizers were "inherited" with the transfer to the I.A.M. of a group of locals formerly affiliated with the United Electrical and Radio Workers Union (thrown out of the C.I.O. several years ago as Communist-dominated).

**Disability of the President:** The fleeting indisposition of President Eisenhower last week again touched off discussion of what should be done in case of the disability of the President. Eisenhower's various illnesses, plus memories of the unhappy situation existing in 1919-20 when President Woodrow Wilson was disabled for many months, have prompted many proposals — none of which has gained unanimous acceptance.

One suggestion put forward by editor Wheeler McMillen of the *Farm Journal* deserves attention and study. "An Amendment," says McMillen, "could require the Supreme Court to appoint a board of not fewer than seven eminent medical authorities, each to serve for seven years with staggered terms of office. Thus the most competent sort of board would always exist. It would be non-political and purely professional. The Court would choose men from various fields of physical and mental medicine. Normally the board would have no duties whatever. However, in the event a President became ill in any manner obviously serious, it would become the duty of the board to inform itself as to his condition and, if his ability to discharge his 'powers and duties' were clearly and seriously impaired, to certify unanimously to that fact. Then the Vice President or next in line could become acting President, to serve either until the board found the President able to resume his work, or until the end of his term."

**Book Event:** *Bending the Twig*, by Augustin G. Rudd; The Heritage Foundation; 121 West Wacker Drive, Chicago 1, Ill.; $3.95

Frequently heard, among other "liberal" complaints, is the statement that America's educational system, compared to that of the Soviet Union, is "inadequate." The crepehangers who despair of our capitalistic schools, of course, also favor the woolly doctrines of "progressive education." Yet if they really believe their own (unproved) thesis of "inadequacy," they should weigh this fact: for 15 years, from 1918 to 1932, the Soviet Union gave "progressive education" (imported intact from America's Deweyites and fully implemented) an exhaustive trial — finally junking it as an absolute failure.

Reason: Competently trained citizens — needed in totalitarian as well as free societies — could nowhere be found in the harvest of "progressively" educated graduates.

So runs one of many telling points against the "New Education" marshalled by Colonel Augustin G. Rudd in *Bending the Twig*. In this welcome addition to the growing literature on "progressivism," Colonel Rudd has provided a history of Deweyite influence in American classrooms as well as convincing refutations of the flimsy dogmas of such "Frontier Thinkers" as Kilpatrick, Counts and Rugg. Enlivened by flashes of irony and many concrete illustrations, this book should be in the library of anyone even remotely affected by America's system of public education.

All books reviewed or condensed in HUMAN EVENTS may be obtained, at the bookstore price, from The Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N. Y.

**Letter from STEVENS H. HAMMOND, Chairman of the Board, Whiting Corporation:** "HUMAN EVENTS is the last periodical I would care to give up. I obtain more real information and true facts in a few minutes with it than several hours with other magazines. Also, the many friends I have given subscriptions to are most appreciative."

**TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.**
**Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.**
**By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.**
**Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.**
**Bound Annual Volume with complete index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.**
**The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."**

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
*Contributing Editors:* FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 24 HUMAN EVENTS June 15, 1957

**Article Section** *Printed in Two Sections*

**In this article Eugene Lyons, one of America's leading students of the Soviet Union, shows why Russia's Communist rulers cannot retain power over their subject peoples. Lyons, former Editor of the *American Mercury* and presently a Senior Editor of the *Reader's Digest*, viewed Soviet communism at first-hand during a six-year stay in Moscow (1928-34). For years he has been foremost among a handful of writers working to demolish the paralytic myth of "invincible" Communist rule. In addition to his numerous magazine and newspaper articles, Lyons has written the authoritative work on this crucial subject — *Our Secret Allies: The Peoples of Russia* (Duell, Sloan and Pearce; $4.50). In his book Lyons expands, with a wealth of documentation, the thesis of this article. *Our Secret Allies* may be obtained, for $4.50, from The Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N.Y.**

# THE COMING RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

*By* EUGENE LYONS

THE HEROIC and tragic events in Hungary last fall have finally disposed, one hopes, of the political superstition that successful revolt against the modern totalitarian state is "impossible." There the very elements whose presumptive loyalties were supposed to have insured the life of the regime — the indoctrinated youth, the workers and especially the armed forces — led the rebellion and led it with fanatic zeal.

And the Hungarian uprising, let it never be forgotten, *was* successful. The victory was swiftly demolished, but by a wholly external force — the same force that contained the revolt in Poland and is today holding down the lid in East Germany and the rest of Sovietized Europe.

All of this is extremely significant in appraising the possibility of revolution in Soviet Russia. The Kremlin, of course, has always regarded its peasantry (still close to a majority of the population) as hopelessly hostile, but it counted upon the support of its "Communist generation" and its industrial workers, backed by a new, hand-tooled "Soviet intelligentsia." In the light of the Hungarian experience, it can no longer take that support for granted.

Neither can it count with confidence upon being shielded against the people, should the need arise, by the Red Army. The alacrity and fervor with which Hungary's armed forces not only joined the people but gave them military leadership has not, we may be sure, been lost upon the Moscow hierarchs. They must realize that, if and when a revolutionary situation matures, they cannot depend on their military machine for protection — indeed, the defection of the armed forces to the people's side will then be the decisive proof of that maturity. If they have forgotten that, in 1917, it was when the Petrograd regiments joined the revolution that the fate of Tsardom was sealed, Budapest has provided a chilling reminder.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Moreover, in the climactic hour, in Soviet Russia, there will be no outside force willing or capable of crushing a successful uprising. In theory, Red China might serve in this role; but as a practical matter geography, if nothing else, precludes any effective intervention.

IN AN ARTICLE on his recent visit to Russia, John Gunther remarks — casually, in a parenthesis, as if it were self-evident — that revolution in that country is "inconceivable." But that is par for the course in the history of popular uprisings. Four decades ago, specialists on Russian affairs were ridiculing the talk of an imminent revolution until the day it came to pass. In the months before the Polish and Hungarian explosions, foreign journalists, tourists and politicians were unanimous in reporting that the puppet regimes were firmly in the saddle. True, they detected unrest, but they agreed, in the words of one of them, that "the major sources of effective opposition have been eliminated." Revolutions, described as "inevitable" after they occur, always appear impossible and inconceivable before they occur.

The Kremlin itself no longer conceals the growing ferment among students in its prison-land. The official *Party Life* complains that less than half the students bother to attend classes in ideology and demands that more be done to counteract "false bourgeois propaganda" in the schools. Nor is the restiveness limited to young people. The same publication recently acknowledged that "tens of millions of people have begun to think deeply and independently about what is happening around them, about our domestic affairs and about international affairs." Though it did not spell out *what* these millions think, the accompanying warnings against "hostile elements" left small margins for doubt on this score.

Soviet writers and artists are openly reaching out for forbidden creative freedoms, and there is a note of panic in the official efforts to repress them. For every strike in a Soviet factory known to us, we may safely assume on the basis of past experience, there are many that have not been reported. In the middle and lower echelons of technocrats there are rumblings, directed against the top bureaucrats, that begin to find overt reflection in Soviet literature.

These expressions of discontent are ominously similar to those that stirred Poland and Hungary in the year or two before they burst into open rebellion. That does not prove, of course, that Hungary provides a preview of Russia. Yet the parallel is as deeply alarming to the Moscow bosses as it is encouraging to their enemies at home and abroad.

IN THE FORTIETH year of its total power, the Soviet regime conspicuously lacks that indefinable but all-important element of stability which Professor Guglielmo Ferrero called "legitimacy." It cannot and does not count on the automatic allegiance of its subjects but must rely on unceasing entreaties, promises and, above all, threats. The oldest Government in Europe chronologically, its posture remains "revolutionary" — which is to say, tentative and probationary.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

By its own description, the dictatorship presides over an uncompleted system, a transition stage on the forced march to a distant goal. Recently it has been attempting, within narrow limits and erratically, to relax some aspects of police rule. But the machinery of terror has not been dismantled. The machinery of mental terror through indoctrination and propaganda is as huge as ever. The Kremlin is still compelled to maintain the largest secret-police establishment in history, bolstered by hundrds of thousands of full-time "agitators," a great network of schools for propagandists, multiple censorships, Draconian laws to enforce loyalty and capital punishment for many political "crimes" that rate as misdemeanors or less in normal societies.

This, as I said, in the fortieth year of its existence. Obviously no Government assigns so large a part of its manpower, brains and funds to internal surveillance and terror — which is to say, its own protection against its subjects — for the fun of it. The Kremlin attitude toward the people remains suspicious and defensive.

The only fragment of legitimacy it can hope to exploit — as it did in the latter years of the war with Germany — is love of country and pride of nation. But it has not itself been accepted as the symbol and repository of that patriotism. On the contrary, it must always reckon with the possibility that in time of crisis this patriotism may again be turned against the regime, as happened in the period immediately after the German invasion. It was Stalin himself who explained to foreign guests in the war years that the people were fighting not for him or for communism but for their native land.

WITH EVERY PASSING year, moreover, the Moscow dictatorship has shed more and more of its political sex appeal. In the non-Soviet world — especially in the most illiterate and ill-informed reaches of Asia and Africa — communism still has some romantic and idealistic appeals, but not in its homeland. There the old alibis for poverty, terror and sacrifice have worn too thin, the slogans geared to a utopian future have lost their early magic. Little is left of the original Communist dynamism and mystique. "The Soviet regime," as an English writer puts it, "has none of the charms of novelty. It is very old and very stale."

The makers of the Soviet state had staked their hopes on the generations born after 1917 and raised in the faith from the cradle up. Even many opponents of communism went along with this theory. But those generations, their faith eroded by grim realities, their native yearnings for a better world consistently outraged and insulted, bear little resemblance to the expectation of the founders. If anything is clear it is that Soviet youth is unhappy and restive — groping, as youth does everywhere, for both material satisfactions and spiritual sustenance and failing to find them in their physically and morally shabby environment.

The Soviet leadership pretends to quasi-religious authority. Yet, with the single exception of Lenin, it can offer neither saints nor heroes to whom ardent young people can turn for inspiration. The first generation of Communist leaders was expelled from the Red pantheon by Stalin, who denounced virtually all of them as "foreign agents" and "mad dogs." Then Stalin him-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

self was exposed by his successors as a criminal and a blunderer — guilty of the worst that had been suspected and whispered about him and his associates.

To cap this process of shattering disillusionment, there came the butchery in Hungary, splotching the ruling party with blood and gore. Most Soviet people already know the hideous facts, the rest are learning them from the very Red Army men who did the butchering. George Bailey, an American journalist who reported the Hungarian drama, has written that "the Soviet Army was degraded from a military force in good standing to the crudest type of police organ. As a result, its loss of general prestige and self-respect is incalculable."

The recalcitrance of "fraternal" Communist parties, in Eastern Europe and the West, assuredly hasn't helped matters for Khrushchev and company. The fact that the Kremlin's authority is being questioned by some foreign Communists and defied by others is too big to be hidden. It is manifest in the inter-party polemics.

Thus nothing is left for Soviet youth, and for decent Soviet people of whatever age, to cling to. From this time forward their masters must justify the regime on its merits, not on romantic assumptions, shifting slogans and high-pitched promises. The dictatorship, there is ample reason to believe, is in the twilight of its ugly career.

I AM NOT PREDICTING an early Russian revolution. I do contend that a massive and expanding potential for revolution exists and that we ought to make the most of it in meeting the continuing challenge of communism. To ignore or discount this element in the equation would be the greatest service that free-world stupidity could do for the Moscow regime and world communism.

Soviet Russia, as I tried to document in a book written years before the internal struggle became as acute and as obvious as it is today, has been the arena of a "permanent civil war" between the rulers and the ruled. We possess a fifth column of freedom in that country, and it grows constantly larger, more self-confident, more defiant of intimidation. Ultimately it can be expected to find expression in action, regardless of what the outside world does or fails to do.

It should be apparent to naked common sense that the greatest weakness in the Soviet regime is in the gulf that separates it from its subjects. We are failing, unfortunately, to exploit this weakness, in our own interests, in the interests of the oppressed Soviet citizenry, and in the final analysis in the interests of humankind.

**HUMAN EVENTS** was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

**TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.**

**ORDER BLANK**

**HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.**

Send me.....reprints of "THE COMING RUSSIAN REVOLUTION"

at $..... ☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately — at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED